

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
-----------	------------	---------------	----------	------------------	----------

Final RFP Questions

01	1	F.4, Attachment J-28, and responses to questions 42 and 43	F-2	Given Attachment J-28 only allows for the pricing of DOL rates at Stennis or Marshall, please confirm that for initial pricing and evaluation purposes only, bidders are to price effort under the assumption that all of the work will be done at those two NASA locations.	For pricing and evaluation purposes, the SSC and MSFC sites are the only performance locations. The only NSSC service being performed at MSFC is the ESD Satellite Office so that is the only service that should be priced using MSFC DoL rates.
01	2	L.3(a)(1) and Attachment J-14	L-1	Please confirm that offerors should include a completed copy of Attachment J-14 with their Price Proposal.	Offerors should not include a completed copy of Attachment J-14 with their Price Proposal. J-14 will be used by the Government to order service transactions and level of effort support after contract award.
01	3	Section L.17	L-12	RFP specifies questions are now due NLT 22 August. Is this correct? 22 August does not seem to offer the government sufficient time to evaluate and respond; or offer contractors sufficient time to react, prior to proposal submission.	August 22, 2014 is the deadline to submit questions. Offerors are encouraged to submit questions as early as possible, particularly questions that may have a significant

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					<p>impact, so that the Government can provide a timely response. If a question asked near the end of the accepted period for questions does have a significant impact, the Government would consider extending the due date for proposals. The Government will only answer questions received after the cut-off date if circumstances permit.</p>
01	4	Section L.19, Table L-1	L-14	Would the government consider increasing the past performance volume page count to 40 to permit a more thorough response to the past performance requirements?	<p>The Government will increase the page limit for Volume II from “thirty (30)” to “thirty-five (35)” pages to account for the increase in prime Offeror contract references to “up to five (5)” and to allow for a more thorough response.</p>
01	5	L.21	L-32	Please confirm that the past performance questionnaires shall be submitted to that customer entity with which the company offering the reference has the direct privity of contract.	<p>The subcontractor shall submit questionnaires to the customer, not the prime contractor. The customer is the</p>

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				We request that this answer be provided as soon as possible given the past performance volume is to be submitted on 8/15 (20 days prior to the rest of the proposal).	Government or commercial entity paying for the services.  Having a prime Offeror on this solicitation provide performance feedback on another company that may also be proposing as a prime or as a subcontractor for a different prime could create questions regarding objectivity.
01	6	Section L.21(a)	L-32	Would the government consider increasing the threshold for prime past performance to 5?	Yes, the Government will increase the threshold for prime Offeror contract references from “up to three (3)” to “up to five (5).”
01	7	L.21(a)	L-32	Please confirm that the ability to cite commercial contracts as past performance references does not extend to intercompany contracts, transfers, and any other agreements whereby both the provider and the customer for the service(s) are under common ownership, financial control, and/or management.	Confirmed. RFP Section L.21 has been revised to specifically prohibit Offerors from citing intercompany contracts, transfers, and any other agreements whereby both the provider and the customer for the service(s) are under common vownershp, financial control, and/or management.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
01	8	L.22(b)	L-34	<p>L-22(b) states, “The proposal shall disclose the rates, ratios, percentages, and factors in sufficient detail to facilitate the Government’s understanding and ability to mathematically verify these estimating tools.”</p> <p>Please confirm that the Government is requiring that offerors include a complete bases of estimate (BOE) for each of the 33 transactional services to include the things already noted in L-22(b) along with the offerors detailed rationale as to why the estimates being proposed are reasonable.</p>	<p>The Government is NOT requesting a complete basis of estimate for each transactional service. Price reasonableness will be established through competition and using any of the techniques cited in Section M.4(D) <i>Price Factor</i>. The Government requires supporting information such as escalation rates, estimating factors and productivity factors to facilitate its understanding and ability to mathematically verify these estimating tools.</p>
01	9	L.22(c )	L-35	<p>Please confirm that the requirement to provide financial statements and accompanying notes for the last two fiscal years applies equally to joint ventures intending to prime or subcontract (at a level above the \$3M annual threshold).</p>	<p>Yes, this requirement applies to all entities, including joint ventures.</p>
01	10	L.22(c )	L-35	<p>Please confirm that audited financial statements can be provided by subcontractors directly to the Government in a sealed package.</p>	<p>Yes. Financial statements from subcontractors can be provided to the Government directly in a sealed package or provided to the Prime</p>

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					in a sealed package for delivery with the proposal.
01	11	M.4(D) and Attachment J-28	M-13	<p>Section M.4(D) states that the Government will evaluate the “Degree to which the proposal includes information on business systems and hourly rates and fringe benefits proposed for employees covered by the SCA are provided in sufficient detail to allow for an adequate evaluation and can be directly traced back to the proposed transactional service rates or fully burdened labor rates.”</p> <p>Given the information requested in Attachment J-28 does not demonstrate how ratios, percentages, and factors are reflected in the pricing nor does it allow for traceability of SCA rates to the transactional service rates; please confirm that offerors should include a detailed cost and price model as supporting documentation that shows the price build up for each of the 33 transactional services (hours by category, direct labor rates, indirect rates, margin, etc).</p>	No. The Government is NOT requesting Offerors to include a separate, detailed cost and price model or information other than that requested in Section L.22 <i>Volume III: Price Proposal Instructions</i> . The Government believes that the information requested specifically in sections P-1A, P-2F, and P-2G are sufficient to allow an evaluation of an Offeror’s compliance with the Service Contract Act.
01	12	Attachment J-1, PWS 2.2 and 3.5.2	12, 92	These two PWS sections appear to overlap. Given PWS 3.5.2 appears to be a transactional effort, should this be limited to the imaging task with PWS 2.2 as an LOE being the document/data management task?	The Government does not believe an overlap exists. PWS 2.2 deals with comprehensive document management in accordance with applicable regulations and policies. PWS

NSSC Nex-Gen Final RFP Questions  
NNX14494502R

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					3.5.2 deals with managing the receipt, imaging, filing and storage of documents. Some form of document management exists for every service. The personnel in PWS 2.2 will ensure that all documents (including internally generated) are appropriately filed, classified and retained and destroyed.